

**a seed source** generating pulses in the 1 - 1.15  $\mu\text{m}$  wavelength region which have a spectral bandwidth larger than 0.3 nm and a pulse width between approximately 50 fs and 1 ns;  
and,

**a pump laser** for providing laser energy to said fiber amplifier.

Similarly, claims 59-61 each require *a source of seed pulses*.

As a skilled artisan would know, *a seed source* is a low power source used as a source of the pulses that are ultimately amplified in the system. On the other hand, *a pump laser* is used to excite the laser material. Thus, a seed source and a pump laser have completely different meanings within the art.

The Examiner asserts that claim 1 of the '811 patent "discloses a laser system comprising a seed source (the pump laser) that generates pulses . . .". Further, the Examiner asserts that even though claim 1 of the '811 patent does not claim a "further pump laser providing laser energy to the fiber", this, and other elements recited in the present claims but not recited in claim 1 of the '811 patent, are merely specific features covered by the broader recitations of the '811 claim. This assertion, however, fails to appreciate the very nature of the invention disclosed and claimed in the present application or the respective functions of a seed source and a pump source.

In particular, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the *pump laser* claimed in claim 1 of the '811 patent is not, and can not be, a seed source as claimed in the present application. In fact, nowhere in the '811 patent is a similar seed source claimed, or even disclosed. As mentioned above, both a seed source and a pump laser have specific and independent functions within the context of a laser system.

Request For Reconsideration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/576,772

For at least this reason Applicant submits that the invention claimed in claims 1-29 and 58-61 of the present application is not an obvious variant of claim 1 of the '811 patent. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the non-statutory, obvious-type, double-patenting rejection be withdrawn.

***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing remarks, the application is believed to be in form for immediate allowance with claims 1-29 and 58-61, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to **contact the undersigned** at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Barner  
Registration No. 46,075

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: March 27, 2003

Attorney Docket No.: A7696